The Sun.

SUNDAY, JANUARY 30, 1898.

Subscription by Mail, Post-Paid.

DAILY, per Month	$0 50
DAILY, per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS—Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

No Blow at Cuba by Treaty.

For the United States to enter into a treaty with Spain about Cuba, which could in any way lessen the ability or the disposition of the insurgents to obtain their independence, would be a base or fatuous blow at the cause of Freedom. The American people do not want to see the insurrection stopped, and they sincerely trust that the patriots will never lay down their arms until they are emancipated from transatlantic government.

The seed of liberty has been sown too broadcast in Cuba to be stamped out. Decades of war to deliver Cuba from Spain's yoke have made the determination to succeed an ineradicable tradition. To suppress this particular revolt will be to prolong the contest and increase the shedding of blood.

Spain unaided cannot put the Cuban rebellion down, and for the United States to help to do it would be an act of shame.

Deeper Channels for New York.

A bill introduced into the House, the other day, by Congressman AMOS J. CUMMINGS, directs the Secretary of War to prepare plans and estimates for giving to the channels of New York harbor a uniform depth of forty feet at mean low tide and a uniform width of 2,000 feet, from the Battery to the open sea. Sufficient money is authorized for the preliminary survey.

The subject is one that has attracted the attention not only of the shipowners and the merchants of New York, but also of the navy and the army. A year ago Col. GILLESPIE of the Engineers, who has charge of harbor improvements at this port, submitted to the War Department a project for deepening the main ship channel from thirty feet, as now, at mean low water, to thirty-five feet, between the Narrows and the sea. He said that there were ships coming here that drew over thirty feet, and hence could not cross the bar at low tide, and that this should not be. In like manner Capt. R. D. EVANS of the navy favors, we believe, the deepening both of the 14-foot and the Coney Island channels, so that one could be used for vessels clearing and the other for those arriving.

The importance of the port of New York to the revenues and the prosperity of the country is so well known that it is unnecessary to say anything on that score. Whatever is done to improve it is done for the whole United States. The best plan for improvement is a matter for experts to ascertain, but the mercantile and marine interests will hardly question the proposition that any ship in the world ought to be able to enter or leave the chief port of the American hemisphere without being delayed or hampered by low tide.

Jewish Workmen in England.

For some years the London newspapers have opened their colums to complaints of the influx of Russian Jews. It has been alleged that, being contented with a much lower standard of subsistence, these immigrants accept much lower wages, and are, consequently, driving British workmen out of employment. It is further asserted that, being of an inferior race, they become a dead weight on progress, and that their dirty, immoral, and vicious habits have a demoralizing effect on the people among whom they live. These accusations are answered in the *Contemporary Review* by JOHN A. DYCHE, who is himself a Jew, born in Russia, and a tailor by trade. The answer is an effective one on the score both of facts and of logical deductions from them.

The writer begins by showing that the number of alien immigrants into England has been grossly exaggerated; thus Whitaker's Almanack for 1892 gives 140,000 as the figures for the previous year, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN has spoken of "tens of thousands." On the other hand, the reports of the Board of Trade show that the total number of aliens of all classes arriving in England amounted in 1891 to about 12,000, in 1892 to 11,500, in 1893 to 6,000, and in 1894 to about 5,000. Even of this number not all become permanent settlers, a good many leaving England after a few years of residence either for the colonies or for the United States. So much for the volume of the Jewish immigration. Now for its quality.

As regards the Jewish standard of comfort, it is acknowledged that this does not include so large a quantity of alcoholic liquors as does that of the British workman; on the other hand, it includes many things which the British workman is contented to do without, such as medical attendance, good wearing apparel, and gold ornaments. It is significant that, in a Jewish family, the husband is usually the sole breadwinner; a Jewish married woman is seldom to be found in a factory or workshop. This, of course, would be impossible, unless the Jewish workman obtained higher instead of lower wages. That his wages are higher Mr. DYCHE is able to testify so far as his own trade is concerned. In Leeds, where 80 per cent. of the Jewish workmen are engaged in manufacturing second-class and ready-made clothing, their average wages are from 12 cents to 16 cents per hour, while those of Englishmen in the same trades are 10 cents an hour. It appears that the Jewish workmen confine themselves, for the most part, to coat making, which is the most skilled kind of tailoring, and that trousers and waistcoats, which are paid for at a lower rate, are made by English and Germans, men and women. It is absurd, then, to speak of the Jews taking work away from the Englishmen, seeing that the former command higher wages.

It appears, moreover, according to the testimony of Mr. CHARLES BOOTH, that the wholesale clothing trade is not an invasion on the employment of the English journeyman tailor, but an industrial discovery made and applied by Jews about a quarter of a century ago. Formerly the tailoring trade in England consisted of only two grades, namely, first-class clothing, made by hand and sold to people who could afford to pay at least $25 for a suit, and cheap ready-made clothing, made up by women who had little technical knowledge or skill. The Jewish tailors, by division of labor and the use of machinery, succeeded in combining the style and quality of the higher grade with the cheapness of the second. The result is that, while garments can be sold at a much lower rate, better wages can be paid, and are paid. Mr. DYCHE submits that any one who cheapens a commodity without lowering the rate of wages should be accounted not a curse, but a benefactor to the community. The Jewish trades unions claim to have created not only the second-class clothing trade, but also the ladies' mantle and waterproof clothing trades and the cap, slipper, and cheap shoe trades. As to the charge that Jewish middlemen are guilty of "sweating," the writer in the *Contemporary* testifies from personal experience that a workman is better off under a Jewish than under an English employer. In a Jewish workshop one is not fined for talking or for smoking or for lack of punctuality. As every one knows, the reduction of wages by fines is the subject of bitter denunciation.

Are the Russian Jews an inferior race? If so, the British workman has no permanent cause to fear them, since the experience of Englishmen in Africa has taught that inferior races cannot last long against them. It is hard, however, to reconcile the alleged inferiority with the school records of the Jewish immigrants. It appears that in Leeds the Leyland Board School is attended almost exclusively by the children of Jewish aliens, yet in the returns it figures as one of the best elementary schools in the city. The attendance is the highest, and the proportion of the pupils sent to industrial schools is the lowest. It is observed that the Jewish children are always best in drawing, and the teachers testify that they have quicker perceptions and better memories than their English fellow students. There is noticed among them, also, an artistic element which is seldom found among English children. The notion that Jews are dirty in their personal habits and do not observe sanitary laws finds no support in the statistics of boards of health. It is pointed out, for instance, that in the city of New York the annual death rate per 1,000 was but 6.2 among Jewish immigrants as compared with 16 among native-born Americans, 17 among Germans, 20.6 among English, and 23 among persons of color. Noteworthy, also, is the fact that, although the birth rate among the Jews is smaller, they multiply faster than other elements of the population by reason of a smaller mortality, especially among children under the age of five. This does not look like a failure to observe sanitary conditions.

As regards food, it is indisputable that the Jews are exceedingly clean, what is known as kosher food being prepared according to the regulations for cleanliness prescribed by the Jewish law. Except upon the score of superior cleanliness in matters of diet and in other ways, we could not account for the fact that Jews are less susceptible than other races to cholera and other epidemic diseases. To the charge, finally, that Jewish immigrants demoralize the people among whom they live, Mr. DYCHE suggests that some proof of the assertion ought to be adduced from criminal statistics. The truth is that these statistics show a smaller percentage of criminals among the Jews than among the Christian population. There is certainly no need of a society for the prevention of cruelty to children so far as the Jews are concerned, for they are habitually gentle and tender to the young. It is difficult to conceive of the British workman being demoralized by a drunken Jew or a loose Jewish woman, seeing that the Jews are notoriously a sober folk, and that their women are proverbial for chastity. In East London some of the places that used to be deemed most dangerous have become, since the Russian Jews have settled there, quiet and safe. In Whitechapel the contrast between the native and foreign population is represented as most striking. On the one hand, you encounter people at as low a grade of drunkenness and vice as it is possible for human beings to descend to. On the other hand, you find sober, peaceful, and industrious people, who are poor, no doubt, but from whose lips will never fall an expression that can offend the most sensitive lady.

On the whole, Mr. DYCHE seems to have demonstrated that the Jewish workman, instead of being a detriment to England, will, if he has the rights and opportunities which the English workman possesses, prove a strong and progressive element in the community.

The Split Infinitive.

Not without apprehension do we come to this request and these remarks of an esteemed correspondent in Chicago:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Will you kindly inform me through your columns whether a "split infinitive" is invariably and absolutely a grammatical error? In a recent editorial in your valued paper, dealing with the use of the phrase "some few," you properly take the position that correct English is determined by usage as illustrated by writers of eminence. You cite passages from the Bible and Shakespeare, for instance, as determining the correctness of the phrase above referred to. Although I have never found examples of the "split infinitive" in the above works, yet I have happened upon them frequently in works of writers so prominent that it seems strange if they were guilty of an absolute grammatical error.

For instance I have found as many as half a dozen "split infinitives" among the essays contributed by literary men of eminence to CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER's new "Library of the World's Literature," these essays constituting the introductions to the works of standard authors. I know THE SUN detests the "split infinitive," but it is almost incredible to believe that men of recognized position in the literary world would use a form of expression that is indubitably incorrect.

I ask enlightenment from you, for THE SUN's opinion on the use of the English language is worth more to me than any combination of opinions I could find elsewhere. BLIZZARD.

Here is matter for goose flesh. There are rigid and righteous souls that look upon the split infinitive as the unpardonable sin against the English language. Our correspondent is right in depending upon usage as the final court of appeal. Undoubtedly the best usage has been against the insertion of an adverb between the infinitive and its sign. It seems to us, however, as it seems to our correspondent, that some contemporary writers are fond of splitting the infinitive, or at least are not afraid of doing so. No doubt diligent search would discover split infinitives in the works of writers of this century whose example is more authoritative or encouraging than that of contemporary authors. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the split infinitive, while regarded as accursed by the grammarians, seems to be coming into some use, and is found in respectable writers. Usage is subject to variations. The split infinitive may establish itself in spite of the exorcists. If it is found to be convenient and useful it will make its way. To like it or to abhor it is useless. It will succeed or fail on its merits or in spite of its demerits.

If we allowed sentimental considerations to influence our views as to a question of language, perhaps we shouldn't mind giving a kick to the split infinitive. Prejudice, habit, and the unfamiliarity of the thing combine against it. Yet anybody who doesn't wish to see too wide a division between the spoken and the written speech, will not be too severe against the split infinitive. A man may write "to tell really" or "really to tell," but he will probably say "to really tell." It seems to us that there are phrases in which the split infinitive is the more direct and the instinctive form. Now, if this is the case, a mere literary and dried-flower arrangement will have to give way to the living and natural expression.

Still, it is our present advice to our friend in Chicago that he be chary of split infinitives. If the literary factories produce them in large quantities, they will become so common that we can all have one. Now they are a sort of luxury for those who can afford to use them. A reasonable conservatism and a polite scepticism should be brought to bear upon the split infinitive. The split infinitive is hardly a positive crime. It may come to be regarded as highly respectable. In this year 1898 it still has a slouching and ill-reared appearance. Don't associate with it too much.

National Defence.

At the time of the French Revolution standing armies were small, but when the French people cut off the King's head and overthrew the monarchy all the crowned heads in Europe became alarmed lest the movement should spread and their subjects should cut off their heads and overthrow their Governments also. With unusual unanimity they formed coalitions, and on one excuse or another made war against France. The invading armies, although relatively small, would have outnumbered the French greatly, had the latter depended upon their old regular establishment. Outnumbered and overweighted, the French would have been beaten and the course of history would have been altered. Seeing this a member of the Convention offered a law calling for a *levee en masse*. This was passed with singular unanimity, and for the first time in the history of Europe, if not of the world, the entire force of a nation within the military age and fit for military service was enrolled and put into the field. The consequence was that the French everywhere outnumbered the invaders, and were everywhere victorious. Here and there incompetent generalship and bad administration resulted in temporary defeat; but the general result was that the French were victorious because "they got there first with the most men."

NAPOLEON, while indubitably a great military genius, owed more to the *levee en masse*, which he maintained with increasing severity to the end of his career, than to all other causes combined; and it is to be observed that he was not overthrown and France was not overpowered till all the surrounding nations practically had adopted the same policy and thereby were enabled, through the mere force of numbers, to beat down the French leader and the French armies! The principle at all stages of the great game was to reach the vital point at the vital time with the most men, and that is now and always must remain the fundamental principle of war. Improvement in arms and munitions may give one nation a temporary advantage over another, and may necessitate changes in both tactics and strategy; but it cannot change the fact that, all other things being equal, that nation will win which makes it the rule to be on hand first with the largest army.

The great European nations have all adopted the *levee en masse* and the conscription as a part of their military system. Every sound man within the military age, say between 18 and 45, has his place in the system of defence and has to serve according to age in the active or standing army or in the reserves when they are called out. It is said that every French citizen of the military age, no matter where he is in the world, has at home his company, his gun, and his uniform; that his address is known to the War Department, and that within twenty-four hours after a declaration of war he would receive his summons and be on his way to his appointed rendezvous.

France, Germany and Russia maintain enormous standing armies and are at all times ready to mobilize them on the shortest possible notice; and while the first corps are advancing, the reserves are called out and got ready to follow.

Great Britain maintains but a small standing army, and depends mainly upon volunteers when she needs an increase of force. We have modelled our military system upon hers, with all its costly imperfections, and while we have so far been fairly able to defend our territory and maintain the Union, it has been at an enormous expense of men and money, accompanied by humiliation and defeat in the earlier stages of all our wars except that with Mexico, and followed by a system of pensions the most extravagant the world has ever known.

The late Gen. UPTON, one of the ablest soldiers and most industrious students of the art of war this country ever produced, made a very careful study of our wars, of the forces called out, and of the money expended, and came to the conclusion that our military system, or lack of system, was the most costly and the most inefficient of any mentioned in history. He set forth his views in an historical work of great value, entitled the "Military Policy of America," and after his untimely death his heirs offered it to Congress for nothing if it would accept and publish it. It is needless to say there was no politics in it, and that, although the Committee on Printing recommended its publication, the necessary appropriation was not made.

But this does not deter the younger officers of the army from studying such questions. Notwithstanding the unwarranted denunciation of the army and its honor and honesty which befouled still further the page of a New York Mugwump evening newspaper only a few days ago in a scandalous pre-judgment of the Carter case, it is safe to say that the United States Army never had in it at any time so many officers of ability and learning as it has now, or so many who are profound students of our own military problems, or who can write well and intelligently about them. It is worthy of remark and belief that the personnel of our officers is not excelled for honor, intelligence, and knowledge of their profession by any equal number of officers from any other army in the world. As a class they are better educated, better behaved, and quite as studious as the officers of any other nation. And what is greatly to their credit is the fact that instead of waiting for or asking Congress to publish their professional writings, they have established their own magazines—the *Journal of the Military Service Institution*, the *Artillery Journal*, and the *Cavalry Journal*—in which they publish military papers of the highest value.

The last number of the former named magazine contains a prize essay on "Our Volunteer Armies," by Lieut. S. M. FOOTE of the Fourth Artillery, which shows not only the most careful study, but constructive statesmanship of a high order. He traces our military institutions and practice from their Anglo-Saxon source, through the French and Indian wars, the Revolution, the war of 1812, the Mexican war, and the war of the Rebellion, pointing out with care the condition of the country, the size of the continental, volunteer and regular armies, and the character and cost of our military operations at each period of our history. His description of the civil war, while necessarily much condensed, is full of interest. He shows that our patriotism was almost without fault and as high as we have any right to expect it ever to be; that our militia laws were neglected and inefficient, our regular army too small and too widely scattered; and that we were forced to depend at first entirely on volunteering, stimulated by high bounties, and afterward supplemented by conscription. He points out that with good men and materials in abundance, our great want from the start was for "instructed and competent officers" to teach the men to drill and use their arms, and that if we would prepare the country against misfortune and wasteful expense hereafter we must "provide in time of peace a number of capable officers of volunteers sufficiently large to raise and train all the volunteers we shall need at the first call," remembering always that "at last the man who holds the gun is the man who fights the battle."

Our great problem, therefore, is to call out, organize, and get into position within the shortest possible time enough men with guns in their hands, and fairly well drilled, to meet any enemy who can land upon our shores or cross our borders.

Without following the details of Lieut. FOOTE's statements he shows that, in case of war with Great Britain, we should have to fight both her and Canada, in which event we should require 100,000 more men to defend the country than we should require as against any other first-class power. He points out that it is fully within the resources of such a power under cover of its fleet to land an army from 50,000 to 60,000 strong in any of our unfortified harbors. Inasmuch as any power intending to make an invasion of our country would be free to select that part of our extended seacoast which appeared to offer the greatest advantages and the least risk for the time being, and as it is now pretty well settled that such a force could be mobilized, embarked, transported across the Atlantic and landed within four or at most five weeks after the declaration of war, "we should require an army of at least 100,000 volunteers to prevent their advance, and certainly 200,000 to dislodge them before they could be reinforced." He estimates therefore that we should need about "85,000 volunteers for fortifications, 75,000 volunteers for an army of observation for the North Atlantic coast, 75,000 volunteers for an army of observation for the Middle Atlantic coast, 75,000 volunteers for an army of observation for the South Atlantic coast, 75,000 volunteers for an army of observation for the Gulf coast, and 75,000 volunteers for an army of observation for the Pacific coast; total, 460,000."

Such an army would require from 20,000 to 25,000 officers. Where and how could they be obtained? Certainly not from the regular army, unless every man in it, as now allowed by law, were competent to become a commissioned officer, and were already assigned his place and rank in a regiment of volunteers. While we agree with the late Gen. KAUTZ that the regular army might be so organized, recruited, and instructed as to furnish all the officers required, nothing is more certain than that the present laws do not provide for or permit any such use of it. Hence some other plan must be devised to furnish the officers needed to organize, instruct, and command the men that are to hold the guns in the next great war.

Lieut. FOOTE regards the solution of the problem as fully within the resources of our country, and thinks that we may work out in the time of peace a volunteer system which will give us the necessary number of officers and men "tolerably prepared for a defensive campaign in from four to six weeks' time." His plan is as follows: He would apportion one regiment of twelve companies, of 100 men each, to each Congressional district, including three Territories and the District of Columbia, or 357 in all. This would give 433,200 men. The officers should be commissioned and trained in time of peace. The Colonel of each regiment should be an officer of the regular army, not above the rank of Major, selected from the active list for his special fitness. Obviously he might be a native of the district, or at least of the State, in which his regiment is raised. He should receive his commission from the President, and while with his volunteer regiment, which need not be longer than one month per year, he should have the local rank, pay and allowances of a Colonel. Officers on college duty, or with the militia, could readily take this work in addition.

The method of procedure would be as follows: The first year each Colonel, assisted by a medical officer, would hold an examination for twenty-six Lieutenants, to be commissioned and to hold office for five years. They should as soon as selected be required to get their uniforms and appear at the designated rendezvous for a ten days' tour of drill and instruction by the Colonel.

The second year the Colonel should hold two examinations, one of Lieutenants over 26 years old, for the rank of Captain, and the other for Lieutenants to fill the vacancies in that rank.

The third year he should hold three examinations, one of the Captains for Major, one to fill vacancies among the Captains, and one of new candidates for the rank of Lieutenant.

In the fourth year he should select his Lieutenant-Colonel from the Majors.

Thereafter the Examining Board should consist of the Colonel, Lieutenant-Colonel and Major, with the regimental surgeon as physical examiner only—all vacancies should be filled by competitive examination. The Colonel should drill and instruct the officers, a course of study and reading should be laid out for each year, guards should be mounted daily, and all the duties should be performed in accordance with Army Regulations and the Articles of War. Annual encampments of ten days should be held, neighboring regiments should be brigaded, brigades should be assigned to divisions, and large encampments should be formed at stated times. All officers and men should be under pay while in camp and going to and from their homes.

The cost of the officers under this system for 61 regiments of heavy artillery, 30 of light artillery, 45 of cavalry, and 225 of infantry, including travelling and incidental expenses, need not exceed $1,000,000 per year, an insignificant sum, which might be saved by a just revision of the pension list.

The system has been elaborated with great care, and its feasibility is sustained by arguments which can hardly be refuted. Obviously, in case of war before the whole plan could be carried into effect by devoting only one month to it yearly, it could be pushed forward, by holding all the examinations, one after the other, till the officers for each regiment had been selected, when they could be drilled and instructed by their Colonels, and could in turn drill and instruct the enlisted men.

Evidently our military institutions, as we have inherited them and as they now exist, must be changed, improved and made suitable to all our national requirements, or we shall one of these days meet with great national disaster and humiliation. It will not do for us to depend upon our antiquated, expensive and inefficient system, or lack of system, in these days of large standing armies and prompt mobilization. We do not need a large regular force, but we surely do need such workable and working organization as will give the Government an effective volunteer army capable of expansion, economic administration and of prompt mobilization toward any frontier or section of the seacoast which may be threatened by a first-class power; and the sooner the necessary steps are taken to provide for such an army the better it will be for the nation.

The Winners.

The greatest strike known to industrial history, that of the English engineers, has ended with the failure of the strikers. They have abandoned their own programme and accepted that of their employers.

Whoever calls this a "victory for the employers" is deficient in knowledge and understanding of the case. In consenting to work for more hours and less pay than they had hoped for, the British laborers did not surrender to the employers, but to the force to which the employers themselves had been compelled to bow, namely, the competition of cheaper manufacture, through lower wages or better methods, in other countries.

The English engineers were in the same position toward Germany and the United States, for example, as the New England cotton spinners are to-day toward the cotton spinners of the South. For one reason or another, Southerners can spin more cheaply; and that advantage must be met by the New Englanders, or they will stay idle. For a time the Englishmen refused to compete, and in fighting the demands of their employers they surrendered unconditionally to their rivals abroad. But their acceptance of their employers' terms is notice to the world that the competition from which England has lately been withdrawn must count England in again.

That is not surrender. It is rather a new declaration of war.

For the development of this city's open-air rapid transit to be left in the hands of a Mugwump commission of demonstrated incapacity, of not the most delicate sense of the restraints and responsibilities of public officers, and self dedicated to an underground tunnel, is a grand absurdity.

BOB TAYLOR and the Tennessee Legislature are still in session and obsession. THOMPSON of Marshall has introduced a joint resolution asking Congress to submit to the States a constitutional amendment "making the tenure of office of the Federal Judiciary a fixed and definite term, instead of for life, the Judges to be elected by the people; and requesting Tennessee members to advocate a measure with a limit of tenure not exceeding eight years, the Judge of the Supreme Court to be elected by an electoral college, the District and Circuit Judges to be elected by the people in the territory over which they are to have jurisdiction."

THOMPSON of Marshall has also introduced a joint resolution asking the Tennessee members of Congress to favor a constitutional amendment "limiting the power of the Federal Judiciary so as to prevent its interference by injunction or otherwise with the assessment and collection of State taxes, and to deprive the Federal Judiciary of all power and jurisdiction over the questions of taxation in the several States." There will not be much left of the Federal Judiciary by the time the extra obsession of the Tennessee Legislature is ended.

The Hon. SLIM JIM RICHARDSON of Tennessee must have been affecting when he told the House of Representatives that wages have fallen one per cent. since the passage of the Dingley bill. It is now known that he has given up his intention of becoming Speaker of the next House and has determined to become Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, provided the next President is a Democrat and will appoint him. There may be other men with a talent like Mr. RICHARDSON's for the duties of the Speaker, but nobody else can gallop so wildly over the field of statistics.

At the dedication of a free library in Hallowell, Me., the other day the orator of the occasion said:

"Fifty years ago a little man named ASA FITZ came here with school song books and visited the schools. Immediately the children on the streets were singing his lively musical tunes. Since that, scientific teachers have been so employed with no apparent results."

The old-fashioned singing school and singing-school master were great institutions, full of fun and vigor. If it be true that school children don't learn to sing as well nowadays, it should be remembered that they have many more things to learn, or at least to study, than their luckier grandfathers had.

We commend the following opinion of the *Reading Herald* to the consideration of the baseball magnates who, for some unaccountable reason, refuse to declare for the simple and manifest way of abolishing disorder on the field:

"There is a movement on foot to preserve the decency of baseball which ought to be encouraged. For baseball is in its essence a decent game. There is nothing at all rowdyish in its nature.

"As one reads the accepted rules through he must be impressed with the obvious cleanness and fairness of the game. There is not as much room apparently for squabbling as in pinochle. It is vastly freer from wrangles than croquet.

"A baseball game, then, ought to be a place where women and children could go with entire decorum, assured that they would neither see nor hear anything inconsistent with the gentlest courtesy and the soundest morality.

"But baseball in books and baseball on the diamond are two rather different things. Baseball in practice is not the gentle, amiable thing that it is in theory. On the contrary, quite the reverse, so to speak. And there are a good many professional ball games which a self-respecting woman cannot properly attend without cotton in her ears, blinds for her eyes, and smelling salts in her reticule.

"Various newspapers are explaining that this ought not to be so, and that if the rules are faithfully observed it cannot be so; that if the rules are lived up to, a baseball gam will be as clean and sweet a spot as one may find on earth. And they are accordingly championing a reform in view of the approaching ball season.

"We hope the reform will come. There is no good reason why it should not. The reason it has not come before is that the umpire has not been rated at his true worth nor recognized as sole arbiter and highest authority. The modern ball player feels at liberty to talk back at the umpire as much as he sees fit, which is generally a good deal.

"The umpire ought to be umpire. His word ought to be law. His first word ought to settle things, and the kickers ought to know it. They will very soon learn it if the magnates of the game declare that it shall be so. And by such a declaration, tenaciously adhered to, the cause of clean baseball will receive the boost that it so sadly needs."

There is among some members of the League, we know, recognition of the fact that disorder in baseball exists, perception of the cause of it, desire to stop it, and knowledge of how to stop it. These men must spare no effort toward making their views prevail and giving to the national game its former decency.

All that is needed is an umpire.

According to our esteemed contemporary, the *Buffalo Times*, "so many pictures have been published of Mr. W. J. BRYAN's Mexican sombrero that this headgear is likely to have quite a run of popularity." It is queer that a man who lost his head years ago should take the trouble to carry an enormous hat; but the instinct for stage "business" and "property" effect is keen in the leading young man of the silver show.

Superintendent KIPLEY of the Chicago police has been attacked for admitting that one ornament of that force had done a little business in the Dick Turpin line. Mr. KIPLEY testifies that this policeman had been on the force ten years and had enjoyed a good reputation. One morning the exemplary policeman in question "had been drinking some," and "became a little indiscreet." He "started out and held up a man and got hold of a few dollars in that way, and under the impression, very likely, that he would never be discovered. With his good record in the past, he was discharged and reinstated, because many people vouched for him; all said he was an excellent officer, but he had stopped by the wayside and fell, and we had him arrested and discharged." Presumably the highwayman in uniform argued that unofficial highway robbery had become altogether too common in Chicago and must be stopped. What better way of stopping it than to put it into the hands of the police? Thus the danger of violence would be avoided. The good citizen, seeing that the "holder-up" was a policeman, would part with his money without a struggle, and the unofficial highwayman would be driven out of business.

The Hon. JOSIAH QUINCY, Mayor of Boston, has become a butterfly and a very industrious one. The *Boston Herald* says that "his latest score for a single evening is a public meeting and a speech, a formal dinner and another speech, and three balls." He is in the first month of his second term. He is not hunting for renomination. He is simply letting loose his long-compressed gayety, releasing his imprisoned spirits. By day he plods; by night he prances. There can be few more beautiful sights than to see him when, after a day of thought and concentration and listening and handshaking, he dons the garb of night and goes forth, spreading benignity. The heels of his pumps are heavily leaded. Otherwise, his natural buoyancy would lift him to the roof or festoon him on a chandelier.

New reasons for nominating the One-Eyed Ploughboy of Pigeon Roost as the Democratic candidate for Governor of Georgia have been disclosed by his boomers. The *Cartersville News* reveres him because he is "a smooth citizen" and "he's got the turn on the boys." The *Walton News* sees in him a man of destiny, who "carries in his pockets the left hind foot of a rabbit killed on Friday, the thirteenth of the month," according to the prescribed forms, which include the dark of the moon and "a cross-eyed, bow-legged negro riding a white mule." The *Madison Advertiser* hears ringing in its ears the One-Eyed Ploughboy's letter nominating himself with "a clarion call that will awaken the people from Cobutta to Cumberland." It is reserved for the *Americus Times-Recorder* to give the man a compliment worse than a kick by saying that he is "one of the brainiest of the race." Is it the fate of Georgia to have a "brainy" Governor? Are the Crackers from Cohutta to Cumberland splitting themselves with shouting for a "brainy" One-Eyed Ploughboy?

A bill has been introduced into the Ohio Senate "which, if passed, will strike a telling blow against government by injunction." It directs that, "in controversies between employer and employees, no court organized under the laws of the State shall allow any injunction against any defendants until after reasonable notice, which must contain the names of all parties to such action," and so on. If this bill were passed, the Debsites could sally forth and wreck the property of the plutocrats, who would have no remedy, as far as the Ohio State Courts were concerned, until after the damage was done. The Federal Courts still remain to be dealt with, but their wicked propensity to issue injunctions against "the toiling masses" is to be cut out when the Bryanites come into power.

No one in Wichita likes TOM REED.—*Wichita Eagle.*

Thus are the proud waves stayed. TOM REED may be able to impose himself upon the House of Representatives, but Wichita will resist him to the last. Beneath that calm exterior of his what a passion of wounded pride and fierce regret must be seething! What is power and what is fame if Wichita be against him?

The French Exploration in Persia.

Informations have been received in Paris from Persia under date of Dec. 27, that the French scientific mission, sent by the Minister of Public Instruction, has arrived at Susa. Mr. Jacques de Morgan, the director of the expedition, has come by the northern road through Caucasus and Teheran with his private secretary, Mr. G. Lampre, and part of the light baggage, while Mr. G. Jequier, who left Marseilles in October last with all the heavy material needed for the excavations, has joined him.

It is understood that Susa will be the centre of the work of exploration at least during the present winter. No work was ever attempted on this spot, if we except the excavations made by Mr. Dieulafoy in the Achemenides ruins, which occupy the top of the Susa's largest hill. The glazed brick panels discovered there are known of all the visitors to the Louvre Museum. But the lower strata of the same mounds contain ruins and débris of a more far-reaching interest. On the same spot was the capital of the powerful Elamite kingdom, and of this city nothing is known but the history of its destruction by Assurbanipal. This ground being entirely untouched by explorers, there is every reason to hope for very interesting discoveries.

Down with Malice!

From the Brooklyn Times.

"The man or the organization that, under the mask of Republicanism, deliberately assumes the mischief-maker's part and stirs up into hotter rage the fires of discord, is a traitor, like the dastardly sailor who scuttled the Cuban filibuster in the storm off Shinnecock."

To the Maine.

Stand there in the harbor
Oh, great white ship,
The color of Peace
And the material of War;
Let your cannon roar
Till their echoes rise
O'er the Cuban shore
To the distant skies
Of Spain on her red and yellow throne.
Red,
For the blood of Cuba shed,
And yellow for the gold
Of her honor sold.
Oh, white ship, stand in the harbor
And wait
For the coming of justice,
Ah, me! so late.
Hold your strong arm for the sufferers
There
To lean on and feel its protecting
Care.
Give peace to them all,
Oh great white ship.
But if by chance
There should be a slip,
And Spain should get in the way;
Oh, say,
Shall we have to tell
You to give her h——? W. J. L.

THE FIFTH AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Attempts of a Few in the Session to Overcome the Many of the Congregation.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A day or two ago I chanced to meet a well-known member of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church. We are both busy men, but I could not let him pass without saying: "I am glad of Dr. Hall's withdrawal of his resignation for your sake, for the sake of the Church at large, and for the whole community, for Dr. Hall has been a great power among us these many years. There has been much talk about the matter, even in business quarters. I suppose the trouble is all over now?"

"I wish I could say it is," my friend replied; "we had a grand meeting of the congregation that Wednesday night, and there was nothing left for our pastor to do but listen and accede to the united voice of his people. Until then he had only heard the session's voice, not the whole session, either. I'll tell you the truth; it's just a handful of men in the session, backed by one or two of that little Jew Warszawiak's opponents, with enormous wealth, who have made all the trouble. It's a plot to drive Dr. Hall out. Either he goes, or they, with all their wealth."

"Then, assuredly, I would drive them out, not Dr. Hall."

"I wish we could. I hear the session is holding meetings and telling Dr. Hall that it was not the full voice of his people, though it is not true; but even if it were, it was the free voice, and that little part of the session should remember that their vote did not represent the full voice of the session. Things leak out, and it is well known that some of the session were hushed up, watched carefully, and not allowed to speak their minds, while a strong influence was brought to bear upon the wavering. I myself have heard from several of the members, the very same causes of discontent, word for word, and now they are trying to force Dr. Hall to believe that it would be better for his church that he should leave. I am ashamed that such men should have any place in our Church."

"Well, why don't you follow the example of that brave little congregation away uptown? They turned out the whole session and then proceeded to reorganize. Why don't you? You could re-elect the faithful members later."

"It may come to that; I trust the congregation will rise to the emergency. It has the power. I pray God that we may not so weakly yield to the little few. But two great obstacles are in the way. The congregation is not yet fully awake to its peril and its wrongs; and, secondly, our peace-loving pastor dreads strife and bitter words; and to avoid these he would bear almost anything."

"Well, I have showed you what to do; turn them out, turn them out!" And as I left my friend I could not help thinking, "God helps those who help themselves."

NEW YORK, Jan. 28. PRESBYTERIAN.

An Agnostic on Churchgoing.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I cannot agree with the writer of the letter in your issue of the 23d inst. signed "A Once Churchgoing Skeptic," and do not quite grasp the reasons he advances for the attendance of the masses at church. His talk of "moral tonic" and "mental rest" seems rather vague. Doubtless there are churches in New York where mental recreation can be had; those like St. George's, on the one hand, where Irish eloquence thunders forth beautiful ethics, sound morals, and, in many cases, sound philosophies, and interweaves them with the Scriptural legends of a broad, manly, and intensely human Christ; or, on the other hand, churches like St. Ignatius's, where just as sound philosophies, ethics, and morals are taught, but woven in the fabric of an ethereal, æsthetic, and supernatural Christ. In both of these churches (which, I think I may fairly say, typify the two sides of Episcopalianism), all the loveliest of virtues are constantly taught, and every temporal work of mercy is practiced. But will the opinion of honest agnostics be changed thereby? Will that be sufficient for them to believe the supernatural earthly beginning and end of Jesus as set forth in the Bible, and believed and taught by the orthodox Christian Church? Any intelligent agnostic knows that the question is simply being begged when such "arguments" are advanced. To him, widely as the types of churches before mentioned differ, the position of the one is as illogical, irrational, and as unscientific as the other.

The letter to which I am replying inquired why skeptics cannot accept the "simple truths" of the Apostles' Creed. Skeptics reject them for the same reason that a rational man rejects any statement unaccompanied by evidence or unparalleled in what he believes to be human experience. The writer also infers, as such writers usually do, that the moral teachings of the Bible are a supernatural revelation, bearing the stamp of infallibility, which anything supernatural (or out of the known order of nature) has always been supposed to bear.

Perhaps I should qualify this last statement by saying that it has always been the supposition of the Christian Church. Agnostics, however, believe moral ethics to be the result of human experience merely, filtered to us through long ages, and as yet, perchance, in a state of embryo.

The writer also speaks of "the strongest evidences against skepticism," but evidently thinks it a waste of time to say what they are, and possibly there is still an unrevealed "right manner" for presenting to skeptics the idea of demonology and miracles as set forth in the New Testament, to which Christianity is committed and with which it is bound, all its apologists to the contrary notwithstanding. Until such "manner" or proof is forthcoming skeptics must remain in their present position. Meantime, I shall take the liberty of counselling agnostics against the advice of that letter, and recommend them to let alone the "Life of Christ," by the apologetic Canon Farrar, a "bucket of whitewash" verily; a mass of fine rhetoric and verbiage, in which the miraculous and paradoxical are glossed over or ignored. Let them rather improve time by studying the works of Hume, Strauss, Renan, Spencer, and Huxley, particularly the controversies of the last named with Gladstone, in which the doughty champion of Christianity was "downed" every time. JULIAN.

NEW YORK, Jan. 27.

Pay and Trials of Trained Nurses.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* As I am a graduate nurse from the New York City Training School I was amused by the statement in last Sunday's SUN by Miss Foote that "many of the nurses here at the end of the year had saved $1,000 above their expenses." Suppose a nurse was employed steadily during the year, which is unusual indeed, how could she live in a nice house in a respectable locality, dress well, pay laundry bills, etc., on $200 a year? Yet that is what Miss Foote's assertion implies.

I consider any nurse successful if she is busy six or eight months during the year; by that I mean to say that very few nurses are able to nurse the entire year, even if they are fortunate enough to have the work. We have several examples from our own school who are now in the insane asylum, and others who are recuperating in sanatoriums.

Nursing involves harder and more wearing work than smoothing a brow, smiling sweetly, and flitting softly about; the smile is apt to become forced and the step heavy after you have been on duty twenty-four hours without sleep.

One thing more: In justice to the trained nurses of this city, and my own school in particular, I feel it my duty to criticise the statement regarding the trained nurse who said to the physician: "Doctor, you are giving this patient too much antipyrin."

That remark, coming from the nineteenth century trained nurse, savors somewhat of the much abused Sairey Gamp, and I venture to say that no one but an untrained nurse would speak in that manner to a physician.

When a trained nurse is called to a case the physician expects intelligent assistance—some one who is competent to act in an emergency, if such should arise during his absence.

A trained nurse under the circumstances described would have given an accurate report of the collapse of the patient following the dose of antipyrin, and I have as yet to find the physician who was otherwise than pleased when for any good reason an order he had given was not carried out. A TRAINED NURSE.

NEW YORK, June 26.

Truth Will Prevail.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Why this rather gloomy tone on the part of our President? Is it because we promised, rather foolishly, to try to induce other nations to help us put a fictitious value on a part of our money that would make it unsafe? We have tried, and it did not much harm, we hope.

Is it because his Secretary of the Treasury suggested to retire a part of this money "as good as gold" and substitute a kind based on "bank assets" which we proved long ago to be not as good as gold? That is not likely to do much harm, either.

Is it because we are not loud enough in denouncing the base lie that $262,000,000 used by the last Administration mainly to make good its deficiency in revenue was used to sustain the value of a currency "as good as gold" for fourteen years in which the revenue was sufficient? We are certainly a little to blame in that, but inasmuch as the truth is bound to prevail at last, we may, perhaps, forgive ourselves for the seeming neglect. JOHN H. POTTER.

65 CLARK STREET, BROOKLYN, Jan. 26.